



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Correspondence.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I confess that your illustration (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1857, page 46) has not enabled me to conceive that any difference yet exists between Catholic theory and practice in the invocation of saints; as the applicability of this illustration to the question at issue depends solely upon an undeniable proof that we worship the saints instead of God, and with the honour and adoration due only to God. The terms of comparison necessarily require a direct and positive solution of this proposition; and in the absence of such solution your illustration becomes plain, direct sophistry, which can serve only to bewilder and confound the understanding, and to prejudice the judgment of your readers, and, by the introduction of ideas foreign to the subject, to create a difference purely chimerical. By your illustration you endeavour to urge upon your readers the conviction that we have repudiated God and Christ, and that we worship the Blessed Virgin and saints as gods, and instead of the true God; and this, you say, is Catholic practice—a picture really unique, and utterly at variance with all your other attempts to explain this dogma. But a conclusion thus arbitrarily assumed can serve no real purpose. You should first prove that we believe that the Blessed Virgin and saints set aside the omnipotent authority of God, as the will of the Prime Minister supersedes the authority of the Queen; without this proof your illustration becomes an *ignis fatuus*. Secondly, you should show that we hold as faith that God has no choice! Just as “the Queen has no choice,” &c.; and, further, that we believe the saints can dispense to us grace, assistance, and salvation, independently of God. Thirdly, that “as the real power rests with the minister,” &c., you should prove that we believe the real power rests with the saints, and that it is only from them we are sure “of gaining our desires; as the nobleman who has the promise of the ribbon from the minister is sure of obtaining it.” Fourthly, you should prove that we seek nothing from God; that we expect nothing from Him; nay, more, that we hold Him, in relation to the Blessed Virgin and saints, as the Queen to the Prime Minister in the bestowal of the garter or the ribbon; that is, as a mere cypher. Prove each of these propositions which I have set down in consecutive order, and then, but not till then, will your illustration be logically true; or, in default of such proofs, all your endeavours to make it appear that “the charge of idolatry is justly preferred against us” are utterly abortive. By this illustration, as I have already observed, you endeavour to make it appear that we have rejected the worship of God, and the mediatorship of Christ, and that we depend solely on the saints and angels; for we invoke the latter in the same manner that we invoke and honour the former. But in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, March, 1857, page 28, col. 2, you grant that we retain the worship of God, but that we reject the mediatorship of Christ, telling your readers that we “say Christ is too high, too holy, for us, sinful creatures, to approach,” and that, “He is so far removed from us by His supreme divinity that we require some one who approaches nearer to our own nature, who can inspire us with greater confidence, and to whom we can have access without that fear we necessarily feel in the Divine presence.” I shall just stop to call upon you for a proof—an ample and decided proof—of these statements. I will have no shuffling or equivocating, no sinister imputations; give a proof that cannot be denied, that we say “Christ is too high,” &c., and that “He is so far removed,” &c. You cannot; it is a libel on our belief; all a delusive argument—a common artifice, rather, instead of an argument.

And next, I shall submit to your readers a third version of this same dogma, as given by you in CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1856, page 46, and which is as different from both these already noticed as they themselves are different from each other. You there say, “The Church of Rome is not satisfied with giving honour to the saints according to their dignity, but she suppliantly invokes their aid for obtaining benefits from God,” and the latter phrase you call “the material words” by which you yourself prove that we do not invoke the saints to obtain benefits from them, but “from God.” And further, you grant that we do not invoke the saints as dispensers of benefits; for you add, in reply to my charge against you for having given, in a mutilated form, the decree of the Council of Trent, *De invoc. sanct.*, “We do think it merely captious to object to our having, in order to shorten the quotation, omitted a reference to the way in which either the saints or we can obtain anything from God—viz., by the Lord Jesus—as to which, you grant, “there was no dispute, whatever.” Now, if it were merely captious on my part to object to your having omitted a reference to the way, it must be more than captious on your part when, having admitted the way, and having admitted “there was no dispute” about the way—viz., the Lord Jesus, by which our practice is to supplicate God and only to entreat the saints to become joint supplicants with us to obtain benefits from God through this same way, “as to which there was no dispute,” it must, I say, be more than captious on your

part to assert, without a scintilla of proof, in contradiction to your own plain statements just noticed, though we now “say Christ is too high, too holy for us, sinful creatures, to approach,” and that “He is so far removed from us by His supreme divinity that we require some one,” &c.—that is, some other mediator. (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, March, 1857, p. 28, col. 2.) But by your illustration (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1857, page 46), as noticed above, you would make it appear that we worship neither God nor Christ, but only the Blessed Virgin and saints. I beg you will explain how it happens that in March, 1856, as you grant, we Catholics worshipped God to obtain benefits from Him through the mediatorship of Christ Jesus, and that we only invoked the saints as joint supplicants, &c.; that such then was Catholic practice, and that in March, 1857, we should have rejected the mediatorship of Christ, thinking Him too high, too holy, &c., and invoke the saints as our mediators and dispensers of grace, assistance, &c., and that in April, 1857, we should now explode the worship of God and Christ, and worship and invoke the Blessed Virgin and saints as gods, and instead of the true God. Reconcile, if you can, these three versions of Catholic practice which are marked by such palpable contradictions, and show that each of them is truly a proper explanation of the invocation of saints. But I need not ask you to do what is impossible; there can be no agreement between statements so incongruous, so contradictory, and so much at variance with each other: they must be the enunciations of as many different systems; and hence it may be fairly concluded that you have not yet penetrated into the verity, the intrinsic reality of this Catholic dogma. Give the proofs which I require respecting the propriety of these three conflicting systems of Catholic invocation of saints, and I pledge myself to prove, not alone from Du Pin, but from other and better authority, that the extract from the homily on Ezekiel, instead of being either a rhetorical apostrophe or a rhetorical exhortation, is a plain, direct prayer of invocation to the angel, expressing the genuine belief both of Origen and of the Catholic Church of his time.

When the Catholic Church teaches that the saints in heaven are far above us, she only copies after the teaching of our divine Lord, who calls John the Baptist “more than a prophet,” and that “Among them who are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.” (Matthew xi. 9, 11.) This reduces your mountain to a mole-hill.

I proved in my letter (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, March, 1857, page 33), that the saints in heaven are still living members of the holy Catholic Church, and form with us that one body of which Christ is the head (Col. i. 18); thus “are we fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God” (Ephes. ii. 19). And yet you decry this as “a singular kind of partnership,” which is all you can say against it. Our contributions are supplied from that fountain of inestimable treasures—the merits of Christ’s passion, and of His bitter death on the cross; and from this fountain a beggar may, doubtless, draw as abundantly as a Rothschild. In the prayer, “We fly to thy protection, holy Mother of God,” &c., which you say you cited to show the Catholic practice, you assert that “you omitted these words (pray for us) because you did not find them;” but I tell you you have not omitted them because you could not find, but because it would not do to find them: any one who would wish to do so could find them. I maintain that the dedication of the month of May to the honour and worship of God, in the name of the Blessed Virgin, is no more the worship of the Blessed Virgin than the dedication of Patrick’s Church, Dublin, in the name of St. Patrick, is the worship of the apostle of Ireland. Call this equivocation, if you can. Your discordant versions of the invocation of saints (Catholic practice) are the only proofs you afford the Protestant readers of the LAYMAN that we sacrifice in the Eucharist to the honour of the saints; that we “do alms-giving and other works of religion to please them;” that we pray “to the saints to grant us blessings.” In fine, these discrepancies are the only proofs you can give them that “we avowedly worship the saints with a religious worship;” that is, with the worship due to God alone. These heterogeneous statements are the only arguments you adduce to prove a difference between our theory and practice; to show that some of the early converts to Christianity “brought into their religious creed and worship many of the opinions and practices of the false religions in which they had been educated;” and that “it seemed both convenient and natural to put the saints and martyrs of the Christian Church in the place of the demigods of polytheism;” and that thus “Christianity was semi-paganised, while pagans were semi-Christianised.” Thus it is you controvert the words of our Lord, who says of his Church (Matt. xvi. 18), “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it:” thus do you maintain that Christ made a compromise with Satan, and admitted him a partner in the government of his Church, in contradiction to John xix. 16, “And I will ask the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever—the Spirit of Truth;” and verse 26, “But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things.” Did this teaching of the Paraclete do no more

than semi-Christianise the pagan? Again, our Saviour says, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, “Going, therefore, teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.” Christ here pledges Himself to watch over the teaching of His Church, from its first establishment to the end of the world; and you insinuate, in contradiction to this, that He adopted Satan as one of His principal teachers, by whose agency many of the most distinguished “converts to Christianity” brought into their religious creed and worship many of the opinions and practices of their false religions.

But all you have stated in this respect is mere assertion, or rather an ideal sketch to which you find it impossible to impart a reality; and as it rests only on such basis as the incoherent and Babel-like descriptions which you have fabricated, and which you offer, without a single proof of their genuineness, as so many different illustrations of Catholic practice in the invocation of saints. Give the proof which I have already demanded, that our practice can be represented under three different and incongruous phases, and then I will grant the truth of your assertion, that “we have put the saints and martyrs of the Christian Church in the place of the demigods of polytheism;” or, in default of such proofs, all your statements must pass for so many irrelevancies, a mere flourish of kettle-drums, as I shall prove on some future occasion.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

Our readers may remember that, when we were discussing the question whether a certain passage ascribed to Origen could be relied on as really his, Mr. Power cited the authority of Du Pin as opposed to our opinion. We were at the time surprised to hear that a man of Du Pin’s learning and candour should have expressed an opinion contrary to that in which all good scholars are agreed. But on referring to Du Pin’s works we found that he was very far, indeed, from having done so, and that his real opinion was very strongly on our side of the question.

Now, we neither profess infallibility ourselves nor do we expect it from our correspondents, and we, therefore, should not think the worse of any one for inadvertently making a mistake. But we think that any one who is accused of such an error is bound to disprove it if he can; and if not, candidly to acknowledge it, account for it, and express some regret for it. If Mr. Power had now observed total silence on the subject of Du Pin, although this would not have been what we consider the proper course, still we should have been magnanimous enough to say no more about it. Just as on a former occasion when Mr. Power defended the invocation of angels by quoting a passage where Origen says that the angels help us, leaving out the very important words that they help us without being asked; and when he resumed the controversy without ever apologising or accounting for the omission, we were content to let the thing pass over in silence. But we must say that we do feel indignant now at Mr. Power’s attempt to get out of his present scrape with a flourish of trumpets and a promise to produce at some future time evidence from “Du Pin and from other and better authority,” not, indeed, that the passage in dispute was really written by Origen (which was what he cited Du Pin for before), but that it is to be interpreted in conformity with Roman Catholic doctrine. Now, if Du Pin has ever expressed an opinion contrary to that cited by us in our last number, let us have it at once, and this will be Mr. Power’s best justification; but if no such passage can be produced, the “other and better authority” will be no excuse for misrepresenting Du Pin.

As for the counter charge Mr. Power has made against us, of misrepresenting Roman Catholic doctrine, we can confidently say that we have never done so consciously. We have drawn our statements from the best Roman Catholic writers and from their most popular books of devotion, and we have freely opened our columns to every Roman Catholic correspondent who thought he could correct our statements. If any reader of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN is ignorant what Roman Catholics really hold on this or any other subject it is certainly not our fault.

Mr. Power, however, now puts charges into our mouths which we never made. He represents us as accusing Roman Catholics of “repudiating God and Christ,” “rejecting the worship of God,” “exploding the worship of God and Christ.” When Mr. Power has shown where we have made these charges it will be time enough to ask us to substantiate them. We never denied that Roman Catholics made prayers to God—we never denied that they use the mediation of Christ; but we say that in addition they use the mediation of others to approach to Christ, whom they represent as too far removed from us by His divinity to approach, without the interposition of some other. And we say that, in addition to prayers to God, they use direct prayers to the Virgin and the saints to bestow blessings upon them. We do not deny that they ask the intercession of the saints; but we say that, in addition to this, they ask them directly to give them blessings. We cited several Roman Catholic prayers to prove this, in which blessings are asked for without any employment of the words, pray for us, or anything equivalent. No doubt, the words, pray for us, may be found in other prayers, but

not in those prayers which we quoted. The practice of Roman Catholic prayer-books is precisely in accordance with the doctrine of the Council of Trent—namely, that we are justified in not only having recourse to the *intercession* of the saints, but also to their help and assistance (*opem et auxilium*). We, therefore, see no reason to change our opinion, that the practice of the Roman Catholic Church is fairly represented by the illustration which we employed in our last number—namely, that the relation which, in the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, the saints and especially the Blessed Virgin hold to God is much the same as that which, in the British constitution, the Prime Minister holds to the Queen. Mr. Power says that to make our illustration good we should prove that Roman Catholics offer no prayers to God, and that they repudiate His worship. Our illustration requires no such thing. Any one looking for favour from the crown thinks it right to attend the Queen's levees, or else to address petitions to the Queen, even though he knows that the granting these petitions may depend very much on the favour which his claims may find in the eyes of the minister.

Mr. Power tells us also that we must show that Roman Catholics hold that God has no choice but to grant the saints' request, and so that the real power rests with them. We are not bound to show this in order to make our illustration good, because in the theory of the British constitution the Queen has a choice, and may, if she likes, refuse to bestow offices on the persons recommended by her ministers. In practice, however, these are the persons on whom she always *does* choose to bestow the offices. And Roman Catholic writers maintain just as strongly that no doubt God has a choice not to grant the saints' requests, but that in practice He always does choose to grant them.

We quote, as proofs of this, a passage from St. Liguori's *Glories of Mary*, chap. ii., section i., and could accumulate more in abundance from the same work. "St. Peter Damian says that the Virgin can do what she wishes in heaven as well as in earth; for she can raise them that are in despair to hope of salvation. All power, writes the saint, is given to thee in heaven and on earth, and nothing is impossible to thee, who art able to obtain even for them that are in despair hopes of salvation. He afterwards adds, that when the Mother goes to ask any favour for us of Jesus Christ, who is called the holy altar of mercy, where sinners obtain pardon from God, the Son has such an esteem for the prayers of Mary, and is so desirous of pleasing her, that when she prays, she seems to command rather than to entreat, and appears before Him rather as a lady than as a handmaid. . . . St. Bernardine of Sienna did not hesitate to utter this great sentence, that all things, even God, obey the commands of Mary. By these words, he in reality meant that God hears all her prayers as promptly as if they were commands. Hence, St. Anselm, addressing Mary, says—O Virgin, God hath exalted thee so as to give thee this privilege, that with Him thou canst do all things. The Lord, O holy Virgin, has raised thee to such a height that, through His goodness, thou canst obtain for thy clients all possible graces; for thy protection is all powerful. "Omnipotens auxilium tuum O Maria," says Cosmas of Jerusalem. Yes, adds Richard of St. Laurence, Mary is omnipotent, since, by every law, the queen ought to enjoy the same privileges as the king, and since the power of the Son and the Mother is the same, the Mother has been made omnipotent by her omnipotent Son."

There is much more to the same effect in this passage, but we prefer to quote another passage (chap. ix. sec. i.), which illustrates even more forcibly the truth of our statements. "This Queen (Mary) is so benign and compassionate, that, according to St. Bernard, when a man goes to recommend himself to her mercy, she does not begin to examine his merits, or whether he deserves to be heard or not, but listens to the prayers of all, and obtains mercy for all. Hence Mary is said to be beautiful as the moon; for, as the moon sends its beneficent light on the most contemptible of terrestrial bodies, so Mary enlightens and assists the most ungrateful sinners. And although the moon takes all its light from the sun, it operates more quickly than the sun—what the sun does in a year, says a certain author, the moon does in a month. St. Anselm writes—Our salvation is sometimes more speedily by invoking the name of Mary than by invoking the name of Jesus. Hence, Hugo of St. Victor tells us, that should our sins make us afraid of having recourse to God, because we have offended His infinite majesty, we should not abstain from invoking the prayers of Mary, since in her we shall find nothing that can excite terror. It is true that she is holy and immaculate; she is queen of the world and Mother of God but she is clothed with our flesh; she is like ourselves—a child of Adam. . . .

"We should be persuaded that the protection of Mary is greater and more powerful than we can conceive. Why, asks a certain author, does that Lord who in the old law punished sin with so cruel rigour now show so many mercies to Christians who have been guilty of the greatest crimes? He answers, He does all for the sake and through the merits of—Mary. Oh! says St. Fulgentius, how long since should the world have been destroyed had not Mary sustained it by her intercession. But, says Arnoldus, we can go with confidence to God and hope all good from Him, now that the Son is a mediator before the Father, and that the Mother is an advocate with the Son. How

can the Father refuse to hear the Son when He exhibits the wounds that He suffered for sinners, and how can the Son refuse to hear the Mother when she shows Him the breasts that gave Him suck?"

We appeal now to our readers whether we were rightfully accused of misrepresenting Roman Catholic doctrines, and whether the reality is not far worse than we had described it. Mr. Power may refine and distinguish as he will, but no one acquainted with the New Testament can be brought to fancy that the religion of the foregoing extract is the religion of the Bible. We need scarcely look further than the very passage cited by Mr. Power himself, "There hath not been a greater prophet than John the Baptist, notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." So far from this text proving that there are saints infinitely above us, who may appear as our mediators with Jesus; it states, in the strongest language, the privileges of the very meanest believer under the Gospel dispensation. We are no longer afar off, we can come boldly to Jesus in full confidence in His sympathy and His love, and His willingness to hear us. They who have proved by experience the happiness of pouring out their souls to Him, and trusting to His boundless love and readiness to hear all their petitions, cannot but feel indignant, as if they were being robbed of their most precious earthly treasure, when they are told that they cannot venture to come themselves directly to Him, but must look for other mediators whom He will not reject; when they are told that there are other names by invoking which help can be more speedily obtained than by calling on His—that there are other ladders to heaven by which we may safely mount when we have tried, and tried in vain, to ascend by Him.

We have now answered Mr. Power's challenge, and produced evidence that Roman Catholics represent Christ as so far removed from us by His Supreme Divinity, that we require some other mediator through whom to approach to Him. In fact, in the foregoing extract it is represented that there is precisely the same necessity that the Virgin Mary should mediate between us and Christ as there was that our Lord should mediate between us and the Father.

THE SHORTEST RIVER IN IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR.—Have you ever visited the north-east coast of Ireland? If you have not, be sure you do when next you take your holidays. Such a drive, I'll warrant you, you never took in all your life as that which begins at Belfast and ends at the Giant's Causeway. For seventy miles (and real Irish miles they are) there will be exhibited to your wondering eyes one continued panorama. On the right you will have "the sea—the sea—the wide, the open sea," and on the left an ever varying scene of wood and dale, of charming glens and mountain heights, and rocky cliffs, the perfect loveliness of which cannot be surpassed by anything in Europe or the world.

There is one point, Mr. Editor, along this delightful drive on which the stranger never fails to bestow a more than ordinary share of admiration. It is where the rugged cliff rises so many hundred feet above the level of the sea, and where you may notice, far up the height, the princely and hospitable mansion of the Most Honourable the Marchioness of Londonderry. This picturesque mansion is Garron Tower, and the headland on which it stands is Garron Point.

An object of peculiar interest to the stranger as he passes this unrivalled spot is a stream of water which gushes freely and plentifully from the base of the rocky and gigantic cliff. Ejected from the solid rock, it proceeds at once to make for itself a bed, as if its full intention was to become, by-and-bye, a great and mighty river; but its career is brief—its course is quickly run—for, after crossing the narrow road on which you stand, it goes the way of all rivers, and becomes lost in the waters of the great deep.

The first time I passed this spot my companion, who seemed intimate with the locality, informed me that I was there and then beholding the *shortest river in Ireland!* And, sure enough, Mr. Editor, it is a very short river—its rising and its fall I could, at one view, behold—its beginning and its end are only a few yards asunder.

But what has all this to do, perhaps you may inquire, either with yourself, Mr. Editor, or with the readers of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN? Well, wait a moment, and you'll see. Not many days ago I was driving past this famous spot, and beside me sat a stranger both to myself and to the place. In pointing out to her the various objects of interest along the road, of course I did not forget to show her "*the shortest river in Ireland.*" But, no sooner had I said the words than who should meet me with a plump, though, to do him justice, a very civil, contradiction, but the driver of the car, one Denis Macaulay. "I beg your pardon," says Denis, "it is not the shortest river in Ireland, and I have good proof of that same, and I wish everything I believe was proved as well." So Denis went on to say, that the river which looked such a short one was in reality more than seven miles long. "Seven miles inland," said he, "there is a stream which, after flowing a considerable distance, sud-

denly hides itself in the earth. For a length of time nobody could tell what had come of it, or whither it went. At last it occurred to some knowledgeable persons that the little river at Garron Point might be that very identical stream which had disappeared so long from view, so," continued Denis, "they resolved to try whether it was or no, and, accordingly, they got a bag of shell-seeds, and emptied it into the stream just at the place where it disappears, seven miles away. Now," said Denis, "the way they were to know was this—if the seeds came out along with the water at Garron Point, then that would prove that the river was not so short as people had supposed; but if they did not come out, then they must allow it was a short river. So, with that," said Denis, "they placed men to keep watch at Garron Point, and, sure enough, while they were watching, out tumbled the very identical seeds. And wasn't that good proof?" said Denis. "I wish," he added, "I had as clever proof of everything I believe."

When Denis had done speaking, Mr. Editor, I said to him—"That's just what the Protestants say about their religion. Many suppose the Protestant Church to be '*the shortest river in Ireland.*' because it *seems* to have had its source from Reformation Point; but on going inland many hundred years we find a deep and noble river called *The Holy Catholic Church.* At its very source we find the Lord Jesus Christ and his holy Apostles casting into it the seed of Scripture truth. A little further on we find primitive Christians casting in the seed of the Apostles' Creed. Further down the stream we find the first four general councils casting in the seed of the Nicene Creed, and putting up a notice that it was against the law to put in any other kind of seed, and that any one daring to put in any other kind would be prosecuted and punished."

So, Mr. Editor, it's easy enough seeing what kind of seeds were put in at the place where the ancient stream was purest. But then came *dark ages*—the many miles of underground; (the same thing happened to the ancient Jewish Church as we read in 2 Chronicles xv. 3—"Now for a long season Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law"); then, as Luther and others watched at Reformation Point, out came, to their great delight, the *very seeds* which Jesus, the Apostles, the primitive Christians, and the first four general councils had cast in; for, does not everybody know that it's the Protestant Church that holds by the Bible, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and that hasn't mixed any other kind of seeds with these, according to the warning and the notice given so long before.

There is another river, Mr. Editor, which makes a great noise as it flows along, and on the surface of which I have seen *another kind of seed.* They call it the *Creed of Pope Pius IV.* There are some simple people up here who are very desirous to know who put in that seed, and when? Perhaps you would throw some light on this subject; or, as they say you have a deal to do, perhaps you would allow some Roman Catholic priest an opportunity of proving in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN that the Church of Rome is not—what many Roman Catholics are beginning to suspect it to be—the *shortest river in Ireland.*—I remain, Mr. Editor, your obedient servant,

Cushendall, May 1, 1857.

VIATOR.

We feel obliged to our correspondent for his lively illustration of what we believe to be truth. Our pages are always open to any Roman Catholic priest or layman who is ready to defend his church in a candid spirit.

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MAY.

Plowing and Burning should be proceeded with upon all favourable opportunities; there is no better preparation for turnips, rape, and late potatoes; and more will be done in cleansing foul land in one season by this mode than in three or four by the usual modes of cropping.

Soiling.—Rye, vetches, Italian rye-grass, clovers, lucern, sainfoin, &c., will now be rapidly coming into use for house feeding the stock. Cut close, that none be wasted. Keep under cover for six hours after cutting before using, that the more watery particles be evaporated, and avoid heaping too much together, to prevent fermentation. Top-dress the lucerns, clovers, rye-grass, &c., immediately after cutting, with rich compost or liquid manure.

Poultry.—Pay attention to the young chickens; let them have a warm, sunny, sheltered place to walk in, with free access to green and insectiferous food. Set more clutches of those you are most desirous of increasing. Feed young turkeys on boiled nettles, chopped fine, mixed with well boiled potatoes, or, in lieu of those, with some good oatmeal. Keep them carefully from damp. Attend to the young goslings, they require soft feeding; and allow both them and young ducks free access to water in fine weather, but keep them away from it in damp, wet weather, or you will loose many from camp.

Pigs.—Fat pigs should be disposed of before the month commences, and all others kept in store condition. Green clover, vetches, &c., may be given them in their yard, or if a clover field can be exclusively devoted to this stock, they will be maintained in health, strength, and good growing condition till the end of the season, when food more adapted for fattening comes in plentifully.